

Notice of Allowability

Application No.

09/604,316

Examiner

Johnna R. Loftis

Applicant(s)

TIDWELL ET AL.

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to amendment filed 1/25/07.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 1-3,5,6,9-19,29-33 and 36-45.
3. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.

THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
- (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
- 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
- (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.
- Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2. ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3. ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date _____
4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material
5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6. ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date _____
7. ☐ Examiner's Amendment/Comment
8. ☒ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
9. ☐ Other _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a response to the amendment filed 1/25/07. Claims 1, 5, 12, 29, and 38 have been amended. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-19, 29-33, 36-45 are pending and have been found to be allowable. The following response includes indication of allowable claims and reasons for allowance.

Notice of Allowance

2. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-19, 29-33, 36-45 are allowed.

3. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The prior art taken alone or in combination fails to teach the claimed invention set forth in claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-19, 29-33 and 36-45. Specifically, the prior art fails to teach a trouble ticket system wherein trouble ticket data is entered into the system, a severity level and status is assigned to the ticket, and the severity and status of the ticket is manually entered and manually escalated, wherein when the severity level is above a predetermined threshold, a responsible person is paged. Further there is a duplicate trouble ticket module that flags one or more duplicate tickets and when the closure of a flagged duplicate ticket is detected, all of the duplicates that are associated with the closed ticket are closed as well. In addition, trouble ticket data is shared with an organization that operates under outside contract, the outside organization assigning its own tracking number to a given trouble ticket and wherein an attempted resolution of the trouble ticket by outsourced personnel must be approved by internal personnel.

The prior art references most closely resembling the Applicant's claimed invention are Jones et al, US 6,219,648, Peregrine's MELBA (disclosed in "Peregrine's Systems forms

Art Unit: 3623

Alliance with Mitsubishi Electronics America; Integrated Enterprise Applications to be Developed”), and Teglovic et al, US 5,692,030.

First Jones et al teaches a trouble ticket tracking system wherein ticket information including status and severity are entered and monitored and an appropriate person is paged when the ticket reaches a predetermined threshold. Jones et al teaches grouping tickets together according to a master number for organizational purposes, but does not teach a module that flags duplicate tickets wherein detection of a closure of a ticket flagged as a duplicate, subsequently closes all of the one or more duplicates associated with the closed ticket. Further, Jones et al does not teach sharing the trouble ticket data with an outside organization operating under outside contract nor does Jones et al teach the ticket being closed upon approval from internal personnel indicating resolution is approved.

Peregrine’s MELBA teaches integration between a service center and other third-party consolidated help desks wherein trouble tickets are created and routed to the appropriate organization. The tickets are monitored and reports are generated based on the status of the ticket until resolution occurs. Peregrine’s MELBA does not teach a module that flags duplicate tickets wherein detection of a closure of a ticket flagged as a duplicate, subsequently closes all of the one or more duplicates associated with the closed ticket. Peregrine’s MELBA also does not teach the trouble ticket being closed upon approval from the internal personnel indicating the resolution is approved.

Teglovic et al teaches communication between two entities for the resolution of a trouble ticket. Specifically, the ticket is created at a long distance carrier (manager) and transmitted to a Telco site (a local exchange carrier contracted or outsourced to perform repairs). Once the local

Art Unit: 3623

exchange carrier completes the job, an electronic notice goes to a manager indicated the problem is fixed and the manager then verifies the repair before confirming closure of the ticket.

Teglovic et al does not teach a module that flags duplicate tickets wherein detection of a closure of a ticket flagged as a duplicate, subsequently closes all of the one or more duplicates associated with the closed ticket.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hice, US 6,370,231 – method and system for calculating estimated time of arrival of a service technician

Swartz et al, US 6,732,167 – service request processing in a local service activation management environment

Jones et al, US 6,763,333 – apparatus and method for monitoring progress of customer generated trouble tickets

Swartz et al, US 6,813,278 – process for submitting and handling a service request in a local service management system

Art Unit: 3623

Cogger et al, US 6,859,783 – integrated interface for web based customer care and trouble management

Kakita et al, JP 2000066998 A – trouble ticket distribution method for use in customer network, involves transferring service from one help desk position to another position temporarily based on predetermined completion of service time

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johnna R. Loftis whose telephone number is 571-272-6736. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 571-272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JL
2/6/07

Catherine M. Tarce
Catherine M. Tarce
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3623